

## REMARKS

The Office Action of December 13, 2005 has been received and its contents carefully considered.

The present Amendment revises the claims to improve their form under U.S. claim-drafting practice and, where appropriate, to further distinguish the invention from the prior art. Dependent claim 11 has become redundant in view of other changes, so the present Amendment cancels it. It is respectfully submitted that the objection to the claims, at the bottom of page 3 of the Office Action, should be withdrawn in view of the revisions to the claims.

The Examiner is thanked for the reminder about priority on page 2 of the Office Action. However, a certified copy of the Taiwanese priority application was filed in the parent of the present CIP application (the parent was number 09/481,714, filed January 12, 2000). It is respectfully submitted that this is sufficient to fulfill the requirements for claiming priority, and that a further certified copy is not necessary.

Turning now to the comments on page 2 of the Office Action about the Information Disclosure Statement, a Form PTO-1449 listing the references is attached.

Turning next to the double patenting rejection, a Terminal Disclaimer is attached. The Terminal Disclaimer fee is included in a remittance that is being submitted concurrently.

Beginning on page 4, the Office Action rejects independent claims 7, 12, and 20 (along with several dependent claims) for anticipation by patent 6,216,224 to Klein. For the reasons discussed below, though, it is respectfully submitted that the rejected claims are patentable over the reference.

Independent claim 7 now includes a step (a) in which initialization data is accessed by a south-bridge chip. Then step (b) of claim 7 recites "sending said initialization data from said south-bridge chip to said north-bridge chip and thence to said central processor unit." Klein neither discloses nor suggests using a south-bridge chip to access initialization data and then sending the initialization data from the south-bridge chip to a north-bridge chip and then to Klein's CPU.

Independent claim 12 includes steps (b) through (d) in which a south-bridge chip reads initialization data out of a non-volatile memory and sends it to a north-bridge chip, and then a processor is activated based on this initialization data. It is therefore respectfully submitted that claim 12 is patentable over Klein, for reasons similar to those discussed earlier with respect to claim 7.

In addition, independent claim 12 includes a step (a) in which a north-bridge chip sends a request for initialization data to a south-bridge chip. There is no hint of this in Klein.

Independent claim 20 concludes with a "wherein" clause which recites that, "upon receiving a request from the north-bridge chip for obtaining the initialization data, the initialization data is accessed by the south-bridge chip and forwarded to the north-bridge chip for activating the central processor unit." Klein does not disclose this. Nor would the reference have led an ordinarily skilled person to a system in which a north-bridge chip sends a request for initialization data to a south-bridge chip, which then accesses the initialization data and sends it to the north-bridge chip.

Beginning on page 7, the Office Action rejects the remaining two independent claims (claims 1 and 28), along with various dependent claims, for obviousness based on

the prior art acknowledged in the present application (AAPA) in view of the Klein reference. With regard to the prior art shown in Figure 2 of the present application, a north bridge 204 is started up and then sends a clock-like signal to a PROM to read out initialization data, which is then forwarded to a CPU 108 by the north-bridge 204 (see the bottom paragraph on page 3 of the present application).

First, it is respectfully submitted that an ordinarily skilled person who wanted to improve the AAPA in some way would not have been motivated to consult the Klein reference for assistance in this endeavor. The Office Action characterizes Klein's bridge 110 as a south-bridge chip, but Klein lacks a north-bridge chip that seeks initialization data in the manner of the AAPA. The differences between Klein's approach to initialization and the approach taken in the AAPA are so considerable that an ordinarily skilled person would have had no reason to think that features taken from these separate approaches might be advantageously combined. Not only that, an ordinarily skilled person would appreciate that a north-bridge chip typically operates at a relatively high speed while a south-bridge chip typically operates at a lower speed for use with low-bandwidth peripherals such as a keyboard or a mouse (see page 2 of the present application, lines 13-17). If the thought of modifying the AAPA in accordance with Klein even occurred to an ordinarily skilled person, in view of their fundamental differences, it is likely that an ordinarily skilled person would reject the notion of involving a south-bridge chip in initialization of a CPU on the ground that this would surely slow down the initialization.

Claim 1 now includes a step (b) of "sending a request for said initialization data from said north-bridge chip to a south-bridge chip" that is connected to the same bus as

the north-bridge chip. This is not disclosed by the AAPA, and Klein lacks anything that might be characterized as a north-bridge chip. Moreover, the north-bridge chip in the AAPA generates a clock-like signal to read initialization data out of the PROM 200 shown in Figure 2 of the application's drawings, and generating a clock-like signal for a PROM is considerably different from sending a request to a south-bridge chip.

Independent claim 28 recites the step of "requesting the south-bridge chip to access the initialization data ...", and the step of "sending the initialization data to the north-bridge chip from the south-bridge chip." For the reasons previously discussed, it is respectfully submitted that Klein would not have motivated an ordinarily skilled person to modify the AAPA so as to achieve a method that includes these steps.

The remaining claims depend from the independent claims discussed above and recite additional limitations to further define the invention. They are therefore patentable along with their independent claims and need not be further discussed.

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing Remarks.

Respectfully submitted,



Allen Wood  
Registration No. 28,134  
Customer number 23995  
Rabin & Berdo, P.C.  
Suite 500  
1101 14<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20005  
(202) 326-0222 (telephone)  
(202) 408-0924 (facsimile)  
(202) 408-5297 (facsimile)

AW:rw